

REPRESENTATIONS OF SYMMETRIC IMPLICATION ALGEBRAS AS MULTICUBES

COLIN G. BAILEY AND JOSEPH S. OLIVEIRA

ABSTRACT. We show that the variety of symmetric implication algebras is generated from cubic implication algebras and Boolean algebras. We do this by developing the notion of a locally symmetric implication algebra that has properties similar to cubic implication algebras and provide a representation of these algebras as subalgebras of a product of a cubic implication algebra and an implication algebra. We then show that every symmetric implication algebra is covered by a locally symmetric implication algebra.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [1] the notion of symmetric implication algebra was defined and it was shown that cubic lattices in the sense of Metropolis and Rota ([4]) are closely related to symmetric implication algebras. The reflection operator Δ is shown to be a symmetry operator.

In this paper we consider some aspects of the converse. We first define a subclass of symmetric implication algebras that satisfy a weak version of the Metropolis-Rota axiom. These are shown to arise as nice subalgebras of multicubic implication algebras (defined below). In the last section, we give an envelope construction showing that every symmetric implication algebra embeds into a minimal multicubic algebra in an extremely nice way. This shows that the variety of symmetric implication algebras is generated by cubic implication algebras together with Boolean algebras.

1.1. Cubic implication algebras. A cubic implication algebra is an algebraic generalization of the face lattice of a finite-dimensional cube based upon work of Metropolis and Rota – see [2, 4].

We recall some definitions.

Definition 1.1. A cubic implication algebra is a join semi-lattice with one and a binary operation Δ satisfying the following axioms:

- a. if $x \leq y$ then $\Delta(y, x) \vee x = y$;
 - b. if $x \leq y \leq z$ then $\Delta(z, \Delta(y, x)) = \Delta(\Delta(z, y), \Delta(z, x))$;
 - c. if $x \leq y$ then $\Delta(y, \Delta(y, x)) = x$;
 - d. if $x \leq y \leq z$ then $\Delta(z, x) \leq \Delta(z, y)$;
- Let $xy = \Delta(1, \Delta(x \vee y, y)) \vee y$ for any x, y in $\mathcal{L}$. Then:
- e. $(xy)y = x \vee y$;
 - f. $x(yz) = y(xz)$;

It is not difficult to show that this structure with $x \rightarrow y = xy$ is an implication algebra.

Date: 2009, February 5.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 06A12, 08A30, 08A05.

Key words and phrases. cubes, implication algebras, symmetric implication algebras.

As can be seen from the axioms, $\Delta(x, y)$ is only of interest if $x \geq y$. In the usual examples the most natural way to define Δ produces a partial operation only defined for $x \geq y$. The normal way we extend to arbitrary x and y is by letting

$$\Delta(x, y) = \Delta(x \vee y, y).$$

In [2] we showed that

$$(1) \quad \Delta(x, y) = x \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, xy)$$

whenever $x \geq y$.

Definition 1.2. An MR-algebra is a cubic implication algebra satisfying the MR-axiom: if $a, b < x$ then

$$\Delta(x, a) \vee b < x \text{ iff } a \wedge b \text{ does not exist.}$$

Example 1.1. Let X be any set, and

$$\mathcal{S}(X) = \{ \langle A, B \rangle \mid A, B \subseteq X \text{ and } A \cap B = \emptyset \}.$$

Elements of $\mathcal{S}(X)$ are called *signed subsets* of X . The operations are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle \\ \langle A, B \rangle \vee \langle C, D \rangle &= \langle A \cap C, B \cap D \rangle \\ \Delta(\langle A, B \rangle, \langle C, D \rangle) &= \langle A \cup D \setminus B, B \cup C \setminus A \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

These are all atomic MR-algebras. The face-poset of an n -cube is naturally isomorphic to a signed set algebra.

Example 1.2. Let B be a Boolean algebra, then the *interval algebra* of B is

$$\mathcal{I}(B) = \{ [a, b] \mid a \leq b \text{ in } B \}$$

ordered by inclusion. The operations are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= [0, 1] \\ [a, b] \vee [c, d] &= [a \wedge c, b \vee d] \\ \Delta([a, b], [c, d]) &= [a \vee (b \wedge \bar{d}), b \wedge (a \vee \bar{c})]. \end{aligned}$$

These are all atomic MR-algebras. For further details see [2].

We note that $\mathcal{S}(X)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}(\wp(X))$.

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic implication algebra. Then for any $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ we define the (partial) operation $\hat{}$ (caret) by:

$$x \hat{} y = x \wedge \Delta(x \vee y, y)$$

whenever this meet exists.

From (1) we have

$$(2) \quad x \hat{} y = x \wedge \Delta(x \vee y, y) = x \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, xy).$$

Lemma 1.4. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a cubic implication algebra then $\mathcal{L}$ is an MR-algebra iff the caret operation is total.

Proof. See [3] theorem 12. □

Investigating the structure of cubic implication algebras leads us to consider certain important subalgebras.

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic implication algebra, and $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Then the localization of $\mathcal{L}$ at x is the set

$$\mathcal{L}_x = \{y \in \mathcal{L} \mid \exists z \geq x \Delta(z, x) \leq y\}.$$

Lemma 1.6. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic implication algebra, and $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_x$ is the least upwards closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}$ that contains x .

Proof. See [2]. □

1.2. Symmetric Implication Algebras.

Definition 1.7. A symmetric implication algebra is an implication algebra $\mathcal{M}$ with a distinguished automorphism T of order two.

Because of the nature of implication algebras it can be shown that if $\tau: 2 \times 2 \rightarrow 2 \times 2$ is the twist operator, then $A_4 = \langle 2 \times 2, \tau \rangle$ and its subalgebras $A_3 = \langle \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0)\}, \tau \rangle$ and $A_2 = \langle \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}, \tau \rangle$ are the only subdirectly irreducible symmetric implication algebras.

We let $\mathcal{A}_i$ denote the variety generated by A_i

- Theorem 1.8.** (a) The identity $x \rightarrow T(x) = 1$ is an equational basis for $\mathcal{A}_2$.
 (b) The identity $x \vee T(x) = 1$ is an equational basis for $\mathcal{A}_3$.
 (c) The identity $(x \rightarrow T(x)) \vee y \vee T(y) = 1$ is an equational basis for $\mathcal{A}_2 \vee \mathcal{A}_3$.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}_2$ is just the variety of implication algebras.

If $\mathcal{L}$ is a cubic implication algebra then $x \mapsto \Delta(1, x)$ induces a symmetric implication structure on $\mathcal{L}$. Because of axiom (a) these are in $\mathcal{A}_3$.

We are interested in the variety $\mathcal{A}_2 \vee \mathcal{A}_3$.

We noted above that in cubic implication algebras and MR-algebras the operation $\langle x, y \rangle \mapsto x \wedge \Delta(1, xy)$ is quite important. In general this is not total in symmetric implication algebras, but we note that it is defined for $x \geq y$ in each of $\mathcal{A}_2$, $\mathcal{A}_3$ and $\mathcal{A}_4$.

Definition 1.9. A locally symmetric implication algebra is a symmetric implication algebra in which the meet $x \wedge T(x \rightarrow y)$ exists whenever $x \geq y$.

Not every symmetric implication algebra is locally symmetric, but all cubic implication algebras are.

1.3. Multicubic implication algebras. We know that every cubic implication algebra can be embedded into the interval algebra of a Boolean algebra with upwards-closed image. We take this as our starting point for the following definition.

Definition 1.10. Let B be a Boolean algebra. A multicubic implication algebra is any implication algebra isomorphic to an upwards-closed subalgebra of $B \times \mathcal{I}(B)$ – where we are assuming a partial operation Δ as usual on $\mathcal{I}(B)$ and extending it as the identity on B .

Notice that we could have instead defined multicubic implication algebras using subalgebras of $B_1 \times \mathcal{I}(B_2)$ where both B_1 and B_2 are Boolean algebras. This is immediate as $B_1 \times \mathcal{I}(B_2)$ is an upwards closed subalgebra of $B_1 \times B_2 \times \mathcal{I}(B_1 \times B_2)$.

The examples of the next section provide some reason for our nomenclature.

2. MULTICUBES

In this section we provide an example of a class of multicubes and a construction of a multicubic implication algebra. This example is highly geometric, extending one way of looking at n -cubes. The class of multicubes described here essentially contains all finite examples, although the proof of this will not be given in this paper.

Let $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For each $i \in \Omega$ let $M_i = \{-n_i, \dots, 0, \dots, n_i\}$ be a finite $\mathbb{Z}$ -module of odd size. Let $\mathcal{V} = \prod_{i=1}^n M_i$. Elements of $\mathcal{V}$ will be denoted by $\vec{v}$ with i^{th} component $(\vec{v})_i$. We will distinguish certain formal vectors e_i such that $(e_i)_j = \delta_{ij}$. Note also that M_i being of odd size is equivalent to the property

$$\forall m \ 2m = 0 \Rightarrow m = 0$$

This property will be used implicitly, without mention in many of the results that follow.

For $A \subseteq \Omega$ define $X_A = \llbracket \{e_\alpha \mid \alpha \in A\} \rrbracket$ where $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ means the submodule generated by S .

Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} X_A \cap X_B &= X_{A \cap B} \\ \text{and} \quad X_A + X_B &= X_{A \cup B}. \end{aligned}$$

2.1. Order and Operations. Define a partial order $\mathbf{P} = \langle P, \leq \rangle$ by

$$P = \{\vec{d} + X_A \mid \vec{d} \in \mathcal{V}, \text{ and } A \subseteq \Omega\} \text{ and } \leq \text{ is } \subseteq.$$

This is a suborder of the poset of “affine subspaces” of $\mathcal{V}$, and will be called a *multicube*.

Lemma 2.1. (a) $\vec{d} + X_A \leq \vec{b} + X_B$ iff $A \subseteq B$ and $\vec{b} - \vec{d} \in X_B$.

(b) $\vec{d} + X_A < \vec{b} + X_B$ iff $\vec{d} + X_A \leq \vec{b} + X_B$ and $A \neq B$.

(c) $\vec{d} + X_A \leq \vec{b} + X_B$ implies $\vec{d} + X_B = \vec{b} + X_B$.

Proof. Clear. □

We make $\mathbf{P}$ into an upper semilattice by defining some meets and all joins as follows:

Definition 2.2.

$$(\vec{d} + X_A) \wedge (\vec{b} + X_B) = \begin{cases} \vec{c} + X_{A \cap B} & \text{if } c \in (\vec{d} + X_A) \cap (\vec{b} + X_B) \text{ exists} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that $(\vec{d} + X_A) \wedge (\vec{d} + X_B) = (\vec{d} + X_{A \cap B})$.

Before we can define join, we must define an operation that captures the difference between two elements of our partial order.

Definition 2.3. (Of $[-, -]$)

If $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ we define

$$[\vec{a}, \vec{b}] = \{i \in \Omega \mid a_i \neq b_i\} \quad \text{where } \vec{a} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i.$$

Note that this is not the same as $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket$.

Here are some of the basic properties of $[-, -]$.

Proposition 2.4. Let $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathcal{V}$. Then

- (1). $[\vec{a}, \vec{b}] = [\vec{b}, \vec{a}]$;
- (2). $[\vec{a}, \vec{b}] = [\vec{a} - \vec{b}, \vec{0}]$ and hence $[\vec{a} + \vec{x}, \vec{b} + \vec{x}] = [\vec{a}, \vec{b}]$;
- (3). $[\vec{a} - \vec{b}, \vec{0}] \subseteq [\vec{a}, \vec{0}] \cup [\vec{b}, \vec{0}]$ with equality iff $[\vec{a}, \vec{0}] \cap [\vec{b}, \vec{0}] = \emptyset$;

- (4). $[\vec{a}, \vec{0}]$ is the support of $\vec{a}$;
- (5). $[\vec{a}, \vec{a}] = \emptyset$;
- (6). $[\vec{a}, \vec{0}] \subseteq A \Leftrightarrow \vec{a} \in X_A$.

Proof. Immediate. □

Definition 2.5. (Of join)

$$(\vec{a} + X_A) \vee (\vec{b} + X_B) = (\vec{a} + X_{A \cup B \cup [\vec{a}, \vec{b}]})$$

The reader may easily verify that $\mathbf{P}$ with these operations is an upper semilattice in which every bounded below pair has a greatest lower bound. It also satisfies a weakened form of distributivity.

Lemma 2.6 (weak distributivity). *For any a, b, c such that $b \wedge c$ exists $a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c)$.*

Proof. Deferred. □

2.2. Reflection. We will now define the partial operation $\Delta : P \times P \rightarrow P$ that corresponds to Δ in cubic lattices. This is a particular reflection operator. First some auxiliary notions that help describe the reflection we want to abstract.

Definition 2.7. A vector $\vec{x}$ is B -critical for some set $B \subseteq \Omega$ iff $x_i \neq 0$ implies $i \notin B$.

Definition 2.8. A vector $\vec{x} \in \vec{a} + X_A$ is critical if $x_i \neq 0 \Rightarrow e_i \notin X_A$ iff $\vec{x}$ is A -critical.

Lemma 2.9. Every $a \in P$ has a unique critical element, which we will denote by $\Gamma(a)$.

Proof. First uniqueness. Suppose that $\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2$ are two critical vectors in $a = \vec{a} + X_A$. Then we have $[\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2] \subseteq A$ but also $[\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2] \subseteq [\vec{x}_1, \vec{0}] \cup [\vec{x}_2, \vec{0}] \subseteq \bar{A}$. Hence $[\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2] = \emptyset$, i.e. $\vec{x}_1 = \vec{x}_2$.

For existence, pick any $\vec{a} \in a$. Define a vector $\vec{b}$ by

$$b_i = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } i \notin A \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in A. \end{cases}$$

Then $[\vec{a}, \vec{b}] \subseteq A$ and so $\vec{b} \in a$, and clearly $[\vec{b}, \vec{0}] \subseteq \bar{A}$. □

Lemma 2.10. $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b}$ then $\Gamma(\mathbf{b})_i \neq 0$ implies $\Gamma(\mathbf{a})_i = \Gamma(\mathbf{b})_i$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\mathbf{b})_i \neq 0 &\Rightarrow i \in \overline{\sigma(\mathbf{b})} \\ &\Rightarrow i \notin \sigma(\mathbf{b}) \\ &\Rightarrow i \in \overline{[\Gamma(\mathbf{a}), \Gamma(\mathbf{b})]} \\ &\Rightarrow \Gamma(\mathbf{a})_i = \Gamma(\mathbf{b})_i \end{aligned}$$

□

Coupled with the last definition we have

Definition 2.11. Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{P}$. Then we define $\sigma(\mathbf{a})$ to be the subset of Ω such that $\mathbf{a} = \Gamma(\mathbf{a}) + X_{\sigma(\mathbf{a})}$

$\Gamma(a)$ should be thought of as the center of the affine subspace a . Using this representation we can define Δ . Note that $\vec{x} \in a$ is critical iff $[\vec{x}, \vec{0}] \subseteq \overline{\sigma(a)}$.

Definition 2.12. If $b \leq a$ then

$$\Delta(a, b) = (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) + X_{\sigma(b)}.$$

This operation should be thought of as taking the negative of b relative to a .

Proposition 2.13. Let a, b and c be elements of P . Then

- (a) $\Delta(a, a) = a$;
- (b) if $b \leq a$ then $\Delta(a, b) \leq a$;
- (c) if $b \leq a$ then $\Gamma(\Delta(a, b)) = 2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)$;
- (d) if $b \leq a$ then $\Delta(a, \Delta(a, b)) = b$;
- (e) if $c \leq b \leq a$ then $\Delta(a, c) \leq \Delta(a, b)$;
- (f) $\Delta(a, b) = b \Leftrightarrow \Gamma(a) = \Gamma(b)$;
- (g) if $b < a$ then $\Delta(a, b) = b$ or $\Delta(a, b) \wedge b = \emptyset$;
- (h) if $c \leq b \leq a$ then $\Delta(a, \Delta(b, c)) = \Delta(\Delta(a, b), \Delta(a, c))$;
- (i) if $a \geq c$ and $b \geq c$ then
 - (a) $\Gamma(a) + \Gamma(b) = \Gamma(a \wedge b) + \Gamma(a \vee b)$;
 - (b) $[\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)] = [\Gamma(a \wedge b), \Gamma(a \vee b)]$;
 - (c) $\Delta(a, c) \vee \Delta(b, c) = \Delta(a \vee b, c) \vee \Delta(a \wedge b, c)$.

Proof. (1) $2\vec{a} - \vec{a} = \vec{a}$.

(2) $b \leq a \Rightarrow \Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b) \in X_{\sigma(a)}$. Thus $\Gamma(a) - (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) = \Gamma(b) - \Gamma(a) \in X_{\sigma(a)}$.

(3) Suppose $(2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b))_i \neq 0$. Then either

- (i) $(\Gamma(a))_i = 0$ and $(\Gamma(b))_i \neq 0$ or
- (ii) $(\Gamma(a))_i \neq 0$ and $(\Gamma(b))_i = 0$ or
- (iii) $(\Gamma(a))_i \neq 0$ and $(\Gamma(b))_i \neq 0$.

Since $\sigma(b) \subseteq \sigma(a)$, $\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b) \in X_{\sigma(a)}$ and all of these vectors are critical, case (ii) is impossible. Also in case (iii) $(\Gamma(a))_i = (\Gamma(b))_i$. Thus we have either case (i) which entails $i \notin \sigma(b)$ or case (iii) which entails $i \notin \sigma(a)$ and hence $i \notin \sigma(b)$. Thus $2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)$ is critical.

(4) $2\Gamma(a) - (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) = \Gamma(b)$.

(5) $(2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) - (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(c)) = \Gamma(c) - \Gamma(b)$ is in $X_{\sigma(b)}$.

(6) $2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b) = \Gamma(b) \Leftrightarrow \Gamma(a) = \Gamma(b)$.

(7) $b < a$ implies $\sigma(b) \subset \sigma(a)$ and $\sigma(b) \neq \sigma(a)$. There are two cases for $\Gamma(b)$.

- (i) $\Gamma(b) = \Gamma(a)$: then $\Delta(a, b) = b$ by (5).
- (ii) $\Gamma(b) \neq \Gamma(a)$: then suppose $\vec{x}$ is in both b and $\Delta(a, b)$. Then $\vec{x} - \Gamma(b) \in X_{\sigma(b)}$ and $\vec{x} - (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) \in X_{\sigma(b)}$. This means that $(\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) \in X_{\sigma(b)}$. Since this is a non-zero vector we now have that for some i , either $(\Gamma(a))_i \neq 0$ and $e_i \in X_{\sigma(a)}$ or $(\Gamma(b))_i \neq 0$ and $e_i \in X_{\sigma(b)}$. Both of these statements contradict the fact that these two vectors are critical. Hence no such $\vec{x}$ can exist and so $\Delta(a, b) \wedge b = \emptyset$.

(8) $2\Gamma(a) - (2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(c)) = 2(2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b)) - (2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(c))$.

(9) (i) Indeed let $\vec{c}$ be in both a and b . Wolog $\vec{c} = \Gamma(c)$. Then $\Gamma(a) = \sum_{i \notin \sigma(a)} c_i e_i$ and $\Gamma(b) = \sum_{i \notin \sigma(b)} c_i e_i$ and $\Gamma(a \wedge b) = \sum_{i \notin \sigma(a) \cap \sigma(b)} c_i e_i$. Furthermore $[\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)] \subseteq \sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)$ since $\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(b) \in X_{\sigma(a)} + X_{\sigma(b)}$. This means that $\Gamma(a \vee b) = \sum_{i \notin \sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)} c_i e_i$. Putting all this together means that the left-hand side of our equation is

$$2 \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(a) \cap \sigma(b)}} c_i e_i + \sum_{i \in (\overline{\sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)}) \setminus (\overline{\sigma(a) \cap \sigma(b)})} c_i e_i$$

which is the same as the right-hand side.

(ii) Given $\vec{c}$ as above we see that

$$\Gamma(a) = \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(a)}} c_i e_i \quad (b1)$$

$$\Gamma(b) = \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(b)}} c_i e_i \quad (b2)$$

$$\Gamma(a \wedge b) = \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)}} c_i e_i \quad (b3)$$

$$\Gamma(a \vee b) = \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(a) \cap \sigma(b)}} c_i e_i \quad (b4)$$

This means that $[\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)] = (\overline{\sigma(a)} \setminus \overline{\sigma(b)}) \cup (\overline{\sigma(b)} \setminus \overline{\sigma(a)})$ and $[\Gamma(a \wedge b), \Gamma(a \vee b)] = ((\overline{\sigma(a)} \cup \overline{\sigma(b)}) \setminus (\overline{\sigma(a)} \cap \overline{\sigma(b)}))$. It is easy to see that these are the same.

(iii) Now to compute our Δ equation. The left-hand side is $(2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(c)) + X_{\sigma(c)} \vee (2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(c)) + X_{\sigma(c)}$ which equals $(2\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(c)) + X_{\sigma(c) \cup [\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)]}$. Similarly the right-hand side is $(2\Gamma(a \wedge b) - \Gamma(c)) + X_{\sigma(c) \cup [\Gamma(a \wedge b), \Gamma(a \vee b)]}$. So it remains to show that

$\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(a \wedge b) \in X_{\sigma(c) \cup [\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)]}$. We know that $[\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)] = \overline{\sigma(a)} \setminus \overline{\sigma(b)} \cup \overline{\sigma(b)} \setminus \overline{\sigma(a)}$, and so by equations (b1) and (b3) we have

$$\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(a \wedge b) = - \sum_{i \in \overline{\sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)}} c_i e_i \in X_{[\Gamma(a), \Gamma(b)]}.$$

□

2.3. Local Complementation. In the case of the cubic implication algebras, the delta function enables us to define a local complementation that makes the algebra into an implication algebra. However, in the current situation the delta function may have fixed points and this implies the complementation function is not definable from Δ . However, inspection of the example shows us that multicubic implication algebras are locally complemented with the complement being defined by:

Definition 2.14. *Let $a \leq b$. Then*

$$(b \rightarrow a) = \Gamma(a) + X_{\overline{\sigma(a) \cup \sigma(b)}}.$$

Lemma 2.15. *Let $a \leq b$. Then*

- (a) $a \leq (b \rightarrow a)$;
- (b) $b \wedge (b \rightarrow a) = a$ and $b \vee (b \rightarrow a) = 1$;
- (c) if $b \leq c$ then $(c \rightarrow a) \leq (b \rightarrow a)$;
- (d) $((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a) = b$;
- (e) if $a \leq c$ then $(b \wedge c \rightarrow a) = (b \rightarrow a) \vee (c \rightarrow a)$ and $(b \vee c \rightarrow a) = (b \rightarrow a) \wedge (c \rightarrow a)$;
- (f) $\langle [a, 1], \vee, \wedge, (\bullet \rightarrow a), a, 1 \rangle$ is a Boolean algebra;
- (g) $\langle P, \vee, (\rightarrow) \rangle$ is an implication algebra.

Proof. Straightforward. □

The important relation seen in [4] between delta and complementation still exists in this case as we have

Lemma 2.16. *Let $a \leq b$. Then*

- (a) $(b \rightarrow \Delta(b, a)) = \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a))$;

(b) $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a))$.

Proof. The second assertion will be proven as part of the first.

$$\Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) = -\Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)}} \text{ and } \Delta(b, a) = 2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a)}.$$

- $\Delta(b, a) \leq \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a))$ as

$$\begin{aligned} [2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(a), -\Gamma(a)] &= [2\Gamma(b), 0] \\ &= [\Gamma(b), 0] \\ &\subseteq \overline{\sigma(b)} \subseteq \sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)}. \end{aligned}$$

-

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \wedge b &= 2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(b) \cap (\sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)})} \\ &= 2\Gamma(b) - \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a)} \\ &= \Delta(b, a). \end{aligned}$$

-

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \vee b &= \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(b) \cup (\sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)})} \\ &= \Gamma(a) + X_{\Omega} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The result is now immediate. $\square$

We will now describe some of the algebraic properties of this structure. We note that as Δ has fixed points, this class of examples is not a cubic implication algebra, but a careful analysis of fixed points reveals a decomposition into a cubic implication algebra and a Boolean algebra. In general the cubic implication algebras so obtained are not MR-algebras. This decomposition corresponds to thinking of a multicube as a family of nested cubes.

Definition 2.17. u is somewhere invariant iff there is some $v \geq u$ with $\Delta(v, u) = u$. If u is not somewhere invariant then we say it is nowhere invariant.

Lemma 2.18. u is somewhere invariant iff $\overline{[\Gamma(u), \mathbf{0}]} \cap \overline{\sigma(u)} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We want to show that there is some $v > u$ with $\Delta(v, u) = u$ iff there is some $i \notin \sigma(u)$ with $\Gamma(u)_i = 0$.

Suppose that such an i exists. Then let $v = \Gamma(u) + X_{\sigma(u) \cup \{i\}}$. Clearly $\Gamma(v) = \Gamma(u)$ and $u < v$ so that $\Delta(v, u) = u$.

Conversely, if $u < v$ and $\Delta(v, u) = u$ then we have $\Gamma(u) = \Gamma(v)$ and $\sigma(u) \subsetneq \sigma(v)$ and so if $i \in \sigma(v) \setminus \sigma(u)$ we have the desired i . $\square$

Corollary 2.19. u is nowhere invariant iff $\overline{\sigma(u)} \subseteq [\Gamma(u), \mathbf{0}]$.

Proof. Immediate from the theorem. $\square$

Theorem 2.20. If u is nowhere invariant and $u \leq v$ then v is nowhere invariant.

Proof. We have $\overline{\sigma(v)} \subseteq \overline{\sigma(u)} \subseteq [\Gamma(u), \mathbf{0}]$. So let $i \in \overline{\sigma(v)}$. Then we have $\Gamma(v)_i = \Gamma(u)_i \neq 0$ and so $i \in [\Gamma(v), \mathbf{0}]$. $\square$

Definition 2.21. Let $\mathcal{N}(P) = \{p \in P \mid p \text{ is nowhere invariant}\}$.

Theorem 2.22. $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is a cubic implication algebra.

Proof. Provided we show that $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is closed under Δ the rest follows from proposition 2.13 and lemma 2.15.

If $u \leq v$ are both in $\mathcal{N}(P)$ then $\sigma(\Delta(v, u)) = \sigma(u)$ and $\Gamma(\Delta(v, u)) = 2\Gamma(v) - \Gamma(u)$ so that suppose $i \in [\Gamma(\Delta(v, u)), \mathbf{0}] \cap \overline{\sigma(u)}$. As $(2\Gamma(v) - \Gamma(u))_i = 0$ and we know that $(\Gamma(v))_i$ is either zero or $(\Gamma(u))_i$ we see that $(\Gamma(v))_i = (\Gamma(u))_i = 0$. But then $i \in [\Gamma(u), \mathbf{0}] \cap \overline{\sigma(u)}$ contradicting the fact that u is nowhere invariant. $\square$

The interval $S = [\mathbf{0} + X_{\emptyset}, \mathbf{0} + X_{\Omega}]$ is a Boolean algebra of somewhere invariants. It is not hard to see that P embeds as an upwards-closed subalgebra of $S \times \mathcal{N}(P)$ via the mapping

$$a + X_A \mapsto \langle \mathbf{0} + X_{A \cup [\Gamma(a), \mathbf{0}]}, \Gamma(a) + X_{[\Gamma(a), \mathbf{0}]} \rangle.$$

This mapping will be explained in a more general case later.

Since $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is a cubic implication algebra, it embeds as an upwards-closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{J}(B)$ for some Boolean algebra B , and so we see that P is a multicubic implication algebra.

2.4. Multicubes as Symmetric Implication Algebras. In the example above we have a symmetric implication algebra with

$$T(\mathbf{b}) = -\Gamma(b) + X_{\sigma(b)}.$$

It is easy to see that $T^2 = \text{id}$. We also have

$$(\mathbf{a} \rightarrow T(\mathbf{a})) \vee \mathbf{b} \vee T(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{1}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} a \rightarrow T(a) &= (a \vee T(a)) \rightarrow T(a) \\ a \vee T(a) &= \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(c) \cup \text{pr}(\sigma(T(a)) \cup [\Gamma(a), -\Gamma(a)])} \\ &= \Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a) \cup \{i \mid \Gamma(a)_i \neq 0\}} \\ (a \vee T(a)) \rightarrow T(a) &= -\Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a) \cup (\overline{\sigma(a)} \cap \{i \mid \Gamma(a)_i = 0\})} \\ &= -\Gamma(a) + X_{\{i \mid \Gamma(a)_i = 0\}} \\ &= -\Gamma(a) + X_{[\Gamma(a), \mathbf{0}]} \\ b \vee T(b) &= \Gamma(b) \upharpoonright \{i \mid \Gamma(b)_i = -\Gamma(b)_i\} + X_{\sigma(b) \cup \{i \mid \Gamma(b)_i \neq 0\}} \\ &= \mathbf{0} + X_{\sigma(b) \cup \{i \mid \Gamma(b)_i \neq 0\}} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a} \rightarrow T(\mathbf{a})) \vee \mathbf{b} \vee T(\mathbf{b}) &= c + X_{[\Gamma(a), \mathbf{0}] \cup \sigma(b) \cup \{i \mid \Gamma(b)_i \neq 0\} \cup [\Gamma(a), \mathbf{0}]} \\ &= \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we have

$$b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)$$

exists whenever $b \geq a$.

$$\begin{aligned} b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) &= (\Gamma(b) + X_{\sigma(b)}) \wedge T(\Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)}}) \\ &= (\Gamma(b) + X_{\sigma(b)}) \wedge (-\Gamma(a) + X_{\sigma(a) \cup \overline{\sigma(b)}}) \end{aligned}$$

exists iff

$$\Gamma(b) \upharpoonright \overline{\sigma(b)} = -\Gamma(a) \upharpoonright (\overline{\sigma(a)} \cap \sigma(b))$$

which is clearly true as the support sets are disjoint.

From this we see that we have a local structure in the variety $\mathcal{A}_2 \vee \mathcal{A}_3$.

Our aim is to show that every local structure in this variety can be described as a multicubic implication algebra and we start by describing the reflection operator defined by the symmetry T . Using this operator we then go on and recover a cubic component and a Boolean component of the structure and explain the connection between these two components.

3. DELTA OPERATORS

Definition 3.1. A Delta-operator on a multicubic implication algebra is a partial binary function Δ such that

- (a) $\Delta(b, a)$ is defined and less than b whenever $a \leq b$;
- (b) $\Delta(a, a) = a$;
- (c) if $a \leq b$ then $\Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) = a$;
- (d) if $a \leq b \leq c$ then $\Delta(c, a) \leq \Delta(c, b)$;
- (e) if $a \leq b \leq c$ then $\Delta(c, \Delta(b, a)) = \Delta(\Delta(c, b), \Delta(c, a))$;
- (f) if $a < b$ then either $\Delta(b, a) = a$ or $\Delta(b, a)$ and a have no lower bound;
- (g) if $a \leq b$ then $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, b \rightarrow a)$.

We note that the Δ function defined on multicubes is such an operator. In the class of local structures in the variety $\mathcal{A}_2 \vee \mathcal{A}_3$ the symmetry T allows the definition of a Delta operator which then defines a cubic implication algebra contained in the multicubic implication algebra.

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a locally symmetric element of the variety $\mathcal{A}_2 \vee \mathcal{A}_3$ with involution T ,

We define the partial operation Δ by:

$$\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) \text{ whenever } a \leq b.$$

We will prove that Δ is a Delta-operator for every x .

Lemma 3.3.

$$T(a) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, a).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{1}, a) &= \mathbf{1} \wedge T(\mathbf{1} \rightarrow a) \\ &= \mathbf{1} \wedge T(a) = T(a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.4.

$$\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, b \rightarrow a).$$

Proof. Immediate from the definition and the lemma.

□

Lemma 3.5.

$$\Delta(b, a) \leq b.$$

Proof. Trivial from the definition.

□

Lemma 3.6.

$$b \rightarrow \Delta(b, a) = T(b \rightarrow a).$$

Proof. As

$$b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) = \Delta(b, a).$$

and we also have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= T(a) \vee a \vee ((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= a \vee ((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow T(b \rightarrow a)) && \text{as } T(a) \leq T(b \rightarrow a) \\ &= ((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a) \vee T(b \rightarrow a) \\ &= b \vee T(b \rightarrow a) && \text{as } (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a = b \vee a = b. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that $T(b \rightarrow a)$ is the complement of b over $\Delta(b, a)$ and so equals $b \rightarrow \Delta(b, a)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.7.

$$\Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) = a.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) &= b \wedge T(b \rightarrow \Delta(b, a)) \\ &= b \wedge T(T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= b \wedge (b \rightarrow a) && \text{as } T^2 = \text{id} \\ &= a. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$. Then*

$$\Delta(c, a) \leq \Delta(c, b).$$

Proof. As $a \leq b \leq c$ we have $c \rightarrow b = (c \rightarrow a) \vee b \geq c \rightarrow a$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(c, b) &= c \wedge T(c \rightarrow b) \\ &\geq c \wedge T(c \rightarrow a) \\ &= \Delta(c, a). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 3.9. *Let $a \leq b$ and $T(a) = a$. Then $T(b) = b$.*

Proof. Suppose that $T(a) = a$. Then we have $T(b \rightarrow a) \geq T(a) = a$ and so $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) \geq a$. Thus $a = \Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) \geq \Delta(b, a)$ and so $a = \Delta(b, a)$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} a &= T(a) = T(\Delta(b, a)) = T(b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= T(b) \wedge (b \rightarrow a) \end{aligned}$$

and so $T(b) \leq (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a = b$. But then we also have $b = T(T(b)) \leq T(b)$ and so $T(b) = b$. $\square$

Lemma 3.10. *Let $b \geq a$. Then*

$$\Delta(b, a) = a \text{ iff } T(b \rightarrow a) = b \rightarrow a.$$

Proof. We recall that $b \vee T(b \rightarrow a) = \mathbf{1}$ so that $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)$ is equal to a iff $T(b \rightarrow a)$ is less than the complement of b over a , ie $T(b \rightarrow a) \leq b \rightarrow a$. This implies $T(b \rightarrow a) = b \rightarrow a$. $\square$

Lemma 3.11. *If $a < b$ then either $\Delta(b, a) = a$ or $\Delta(b, a)$ and a have no lower bound.*

Proof. Suppose that $p \leq a$ and $p \leq \Delta(b, a)$. Then $p \leq \Delta(b, a) \leq T(b \rightarrow a)$ and $T(p) \leq T(a) \leq T(b \rightarrow a)$. Thus

$$p \vee T(p) \leq T(b \rightarrow a).$$

But $T(p \vee T(p)) = T(p) \vee p$ and so (by lemma 3.9) we have $T(b \rightarrow a) = b \rightarrow a$ and hence $\Delta(b, a) = a$. $\square$

Lemma 3.12. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$. Then*

$$c \rightarrow \Delta(b, a) = (c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a).$$

Proof. (a) $(c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) \geq b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) = \Delta(b, a)$.

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} c \wedge [(c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)] &= [c \wedge (c \rightarrow b)] \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) \\ &= b \wedge T(b \rightarrow a) \\ &= \Delta(b, a). \end{aligned}$$

(c) Working in the distributive lattice $[\Delta(b, a), \mathbf{1}]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} c \vee [(c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)] &= (c \vee (c \rightarrow b)) \wedge (c \vee T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= \mathbf{1} \wedge (c \vee T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &\geq c \vee T(c \rightarrow a) \\ &= \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $c \rightarrow \Delta(b, a)$ which is the complement of c over $\Delta(b, a)$ is equal to $(c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.13. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$. Then*

$$\Delta(c, b) \rightarrow \Delta(c, a) = T(b \rightarrow a).$$

Proof. (a) $T(b \rightarrow a) \geq T(c \rightarrow a) \geq \Delta(c, a)$.

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} T(b \rightarrow a) \wedge \Delta(c, b) &= T(b \rightarrow a) \wedge T(c \rightarrow b) \wedge c \\ &= T((b \rightarrow a) \wedge (c \rightarrow b)) \wedge c \\ &= T(c \rightarrow a) \wedge c \\ &= \Delta(c, a). \end{aligned}$$

(c)

$$\begin{aligned} T(b \rightarrow a) \vee \Delta(c, b) &= T(b \rightarrow a) \vee [T(c \rightarrow b) \wedge c] \\ &= [T(b \rightarrow a) \vee T(c \rightarrow b)] \wedge [T(b \rightarrow a) \vee c] \\ &\geq [T(b \rightarrow a) \vee T(b)] \wedge [T(c \rightarrow a) \vee c] \\ &= T((b \rightarrow a) \vee b) \wedge \mathbf{1} \\ &= \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\Delta(c, b) \rightarrow \Delta(c, a)$ which is the complement of $\Delta(c, b)$ over $\Delta(c, a)$ is equal to $T(b \rightarrow a)$. $\square$

Remark 3.1. Note that the lemma shows us that the complement $\Delta(c, b) \rightarrow \Delta(c, a)$ is actually independent of c .

Lemma 3.14. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$. Then*

$$\Delta(\Delta(c, b), \Delta(c, a)) = \Delta(c, \Delta(b, a)).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Delta(c, b), \Delta(c, a)) &= \Delta(c, b) \wedge T(\Delta(c, b) \rightarrow \Delta(c, a)) \\ &= \Delta(c, b) \wedge T(T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= \Delta(c, b) \wedge (b \rightarrow a) \\ &= c \wedge (b \rightarrow a) \wedge T(c \rightarrow b) \\ &= c \wedge T((c \rightarrow b) \wedge T(b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= c \wedge T(c \rightarrow \Delta(b, a)) \\ &= \Delta(c, \Delta(b, a)). \end{aligned}$$

□

The next step is to show that Delta operators create cubic implication algebras. A major part of this proof is analyzing the families of fixed points associated with a Delta-operator.

4. FIXED POINTS

Now we turn to a general analysis of the fixed points of a Delta-operator. Let Δ be a fixed Delta-operator on a multicubic implication algebra $\mathcal{M}$.

We begin by developing several properties of the class of fixed points and a variety of characterizations of fixed points.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $a \leq b \leq c$. Then*

- (a) $b \rightarrow \Delta(b, a) = \Delta(1, b \rightarrow a)$;
- (b) $\Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) = c \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a))$;
- (c) $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c)$;
- (d) if $\Delta(c, b) = b$ then $\Delta(c, a) = \Delta(b, a)$;
- (e) if $\Delta(c, b) = b$ and $\Delta(b, a) = a$ then $\Delta(c, a) = a$.

Proof. (a)

$$\begin{aligned} b \wedge \Delta(1, b \rightarrow a) &= \Delta(b, a) \\ b \wedge \Delta(1, b \rightarrow a) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

(b) We note that

$$\begin{aligned} (c \rightarrow [(b \rightarrow a) \wedge c]) &= ((b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) \vee (c \rightarrow a) \\ &= ((b \rightarrow a) \vee (c \rightarrow a)) \wedge (c \vee (c \rightarrow a)) \quad \text{in } [a, 1] \\ &= (b \rightarrow a). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus } \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) &= c \wedge \Delta(1, (c \rightarrow [(b \rightarrow a) \wedge c])) \\ &= c \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)). \end{aligned}$$

(c)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(b, a) &= b \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= (b \wedge c) \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \\ &= b \wedge \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c). \end{aligned}$$

(d)

$$\begin{aligned}
b &= \Delta(c, b) \geq \Delta(c, a) \\
\Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) &\geq \Delta(c, a) \\
\text{Hence } \Delta(b, a) &= b \wedge \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) \\
&\geq \Delta(c, a) \\
\text{and so } \Delta(c, \Delta(b, a)) &\geq \Delta(c, \Delta(c, a)) = a. \\
\text{Also } \Delta(c, \Delta(b, a)) &= \Delta(\Delta(c, b), \Delta(c, a)) = \Delta(b, \Delta(c, a)) \geq a \\
&\text{implies } \Delta(c, a) \geq \Delta(b, a)
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the result.

(e) This is immediate as $\Delta(c, a) = \Delta(b, a) = a$.

□

The converse to the last result is also true but requires a bit more work to establish.

Lemma 4.2. *If $b \geq a$ then*

$$\Delta(b, a) = a \iff \Delta(b, a) \leq a$$

and

$$\Delta(b, a) = a \iff \Delta(b, a) \geq a$$

Proof. The right to left implication is the only nontrivial one.

If $\Delta(b, a) \leq a$ then $a = \Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) \leq \Delta(b, a)$.

If $\Delta(b, a) \geq a$ then $a = \Delta(b, \Delta(b, a)) \geq \Delta(b, a)$.

□

Lemma 4.3. *If $c \geq b \geq a$ then*

$$\Delta(b, a) = a \iff \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) = (b \rightarrow a),$$

and

$$\Delta(b, a) = a \iff \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a)) = (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c.$$

Proof. The first is a special case of the second.

Using complements in $[a, c]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(b, a) = a &\iff b \wedge \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) = a \\
&\iff \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) \leq (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c \\
&\iff \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) = (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.4. *If $a \leq b$ and $\Delta(1, a) = a$ then $\Delta(1, b) = b$.*

Proof. $(b \rightarrow a) \geq a$ implies $\Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \geq \Delta(1, a) = a$. Thus $\Delta(b, a) = b \wedge \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \geq b \wedge a = a$. This gives $\Delta(b, a) = a$.

From this we have $\Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) = (b \rightarrow a)$ and so

$$\begin{aligned}
(b \rightarrow a) \wedge \Delta(1, b) &= \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) \wedge \Delta(1, b) \\
&= \Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge b) \\
&= \Delta(1, a) \\
&= a.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\Delta(1, b) \leq ((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a) = b$ and so $\Delta(1, b) = b$.

□

Proposition 4.5. *If $a \leq b \leq c$ then*

$\Delta(c, a) = a$ iff $\Delta(c, b) = b$ and $\Delta(b, a) = a$

Proof. The right to left direction has been done.

As $\Delta(c, a) = a$ we have $\Delta(1, (c \rightarrow a)) = (c \rightarrow a)$. From $(b \rightarrow a) \geq (c \rightarrow a)$ we have $\Delta(1, (b \rightarrow a)) = (b \rightarrow a)$ whence $\Delta(b, a) = a$.

Now $\Delta(b, a) = a$ implies $b \wedge \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) = a$ and hence $\Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) \leq (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c$. So we have $\Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) = (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (b \rightarrow a) \wedge \Delta(c, b) &= (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c \wedge \Delta(c, b) \\ &= \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c) \wedge \Delta(c, b) \\ &= \Delta(c, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge c \wedge b) \\ &= \Delta(c, a) \\ &= a. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\Delta(c, b) \leq ((b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a) = b$ and so $\Delta(c, b) = b$. $\square$

Now we specialize analysis of the fixed points of Δ to a particular element of the algebra.

Definition 4.6. *Let u be in M . Then*

(a) $\text{Fix}(u) = \{v \geq u \mid \Delta(v, u) = u\}$;

(b) $\Phi(u) = \{x \leq u \mid \Delta(u, x) = x\}$.

The first things we show are that $\text{Fix}(u) \cap [u, v]$ has a greatest element and $\Phi(u) \cap [u, v]$ has a least element for any $v \geq u$.

Proposition 4.7. *If $u \leq x \leq v$ then*

$$\Delta(v, x) = x \iff u \vee \Delta(v, u) \leq x.$$

Proof. As $\Delta(v, u \vee \Delta(v, u)) = u \vee \Delta(v, u)$, if $u \vee \Delta(v, u) \leq x \leq v$ then $\Delta(v, x) = x$ by proposition 4.5.

$\Delta(v, x) = x$ and $u \leq x$ gives $\Delta(v, u) \leq \Delta(v, x) = x$ and so $u \vee \Delta(v, u) \leq x$. $\square$

Corollary 4.8. *If $u \leq v \leq w$ then $v \vee \Delta(w, v) = v \vee \Delta(w, u)$.*

Proof. $\Delta(w, u) \leq \Delta(w, v)$ gives us $v \vee \Delta(w, v) \geq v \vee \Delta(w, u)$. Also $u \vee \Delta(w, u) \leq v \vee \Delta(w, u) \leq w$ and so $\Delta(w, v \vee \Delta(w, u)) = v \vee \Delta(w, u)$, but as $v \leq v \vee \Delta(w, u)$ we have $v \vee \Delta(w, v) \leq v \vee \Delta(w, u)$. $\square$

Proposition 4.9. *If $u \leq x \leq v$ then*

$$\Delta(x, u) = u \iff x \leq ([u \vee \Delta(v, u)] \rightarrow u) \wedge v.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x, u) = u &\iff \Delta(x, u) = x \wedge \Delta(v, v \wedge (x \rightarrow u)) = u \\ &\iff \Delta(v, v \wedge (x \rightarrow u)) \leq v \wedge (x \rightarrow u) \\ &\iff \Delta(v, v \wedge (x \rightarrow u)) = v \wedge (x \rightarrow u) \\ &\iff u \vee \Delta(v, u) \leq v \wedge (x \rightarrow u) \\ &\iff x \leq ([u \vee \Delta(v, u)] \rightarrow u) \wedge v. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Definition 4.10. If $u \leq v$ then $\delta^v(u) = ([u \vee \Delta(v, u)] \rightarrow u) \wedge v$ and $\beta^v(u) = u \vee \Delta(v, u)$.
 $\delta(u) = \delta^1(u)$ and $\beta(u) = \beta^1(u)$.

Corollary 4.11. Let $u \leq v$. Then $\delta^v(\delta^v(u)) = \delta^v(u)$.

Proof. $\delta^v(\delta^v(u)) \geq \delta^v(u)$ comes for free.

If $\Delta(x, \delta^v(u)) = \delta^v(u)$ then as $\Delta(\delta^v(u), u) = u$ we also have $\Delta(x, u) = u$, which implies $x \leq \delta^v(u)$. Hence $\delta^v(\delta^v(u)) \leq \delta^v(u)$. $\square$

We wish to show that the function δ is order-preserving in both variables.

Theorem 4.12. Let $u \leq v \leq w$. Then

- (a) $\delta^v(u) \leq \delta^w(u)$;
- (b) $\delta^v(u) = \delta^w(u) \wedge v$.

Proof. (a) This is clear as $v \leq w$ and $\delta^v(u) = \max \{\text{Fix}(u) \wedge [u, v]\}$.

(b) As $\Delta(\delta^w(u), u) = u$ and $u \leq \delta^w(u) \wedge v \leq \delta^w(u)$ we have $\Delta(\delta^w(u) \wedge v, u) = u$. Then, as $\delta^w(u) \wedge v \leq v$ this implies $\delta^w(u) \wedge v \leq \delta^v(u)$.

From the first part we get $\delta^v(u) \leq \delta^w(u) \wedge v$.

$\square$

Corollary 4.13. Let $u \leq v \leq w$. Then $u \vee \Delta(v, u) = (u \vee \Delta(w, u)) \wedge v$.

Proof. As $\delta^v(u) = \delta^w(u) \wedge v$ we have

$((u \vee \Delta(v, u)) \rightarrow u) \wedge v = ((u \vee \Delta(w, u)) \rightarrow u) \wedge v$. The left hand side is the complement of $u \vee \Delta(v, u)$ in $[u, v]$ and the right hand side is the complement of $(u \vee \Delta(w, u)) \wedge v$ in $[u, v]$. Hence $u \vee \Delta(v, u) = (u \vee \Delta(w, u)) \wedge v$. $\square$

It follows from this theorem that we need only concern ourselves with $\delta(u)$ in our study of fixed points.

Lemma 4.14. Let $u \leq v \leq w$ and $\Delta(w, u) \leq \Delta(v, u)$. Then $\Delta(w, v) = v$.

Proof. This is immediate as $u \vee \Delta(w, u) \leq u \vee \Delta(v, u) \leq v \leq w$ and $u \vee \Delta(w, u) \in \Phi(w)$. $\square$

Theorem 4.15. Let $u \leq v$. Then

$$\delta(u) \leq \delta(v).$$

Proof. $u \leq v$ and $\Delta(\delta(v), v) = v$ gives us $\Delta(\delta(v), u) = \Delta(v, u)$. Also $\Delta(\delta(u), u) = u$ and so $\Delta(1, (\delta(u) \rightarrow u)) = (\delta(u) \rightarrow u)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\delta(u) \vee \delta(v), u) &= (\delta(u) \vee \delta(v)) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(u) \vee \delta(v) \rightarrow u)) \\ &= (\delta(u) \vee \delta(v)) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(v) \rightarrow u) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u)) \\ &= (\delta(u) \vee \delta(v)) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(v) \rightarrow u)) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(u) \rightarrow u)) \\ &= (\delta(u) \vee \delta(v)) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(v) \rightarrow u)) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u) \\ &= [(\delta(u) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u)) \vee (\delta(v) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u))] \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(v) \rightarrow u)) \\ &= \delta(v) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u) \wedge \Delta(1, (\delta(v) \rightarrow u)) \\ &= \Delta(\delta(v), u) \wedge (\delta(u) \rightarrow u) \\ &\leq \Delta(\delta(v), u) \\ &= \Delta(v, u). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the lemma we have $\Delta(\delta(v) \vee \delta(u), v) = v$ which implies $\delta(v) \vee \delta(u) \leq \delta(v)$ and hence $\delta(u) \leq \delta(v)$. $\square$

Corollary 4.16. *Let $u \leq v \leq w$ and $\Delta(v, u) = u$. Then $\delta^w(u) = \delta^w(v)$.*

Proof. From the theorem we have $\delta^w(u) \leq \delta^w(v)$. From $\Delta(\delta^w(v), v) = v$ and $\Delta(v, u) = u$ we have $\Delta(\delta^w(v), u) = u$ and hence $\delta^w(v) \leq \delta^w(u)$. $\square$

Corollary 4.17. *Let $u \leq v \leq w$ and $\Delta(v, u) = u$. Then*

$$(v \vee \Delta(w, v)) \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u) = v.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} (v \vee \Delta(w, v)) \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u) &= (v \vee \Delta(w, v)) \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u) \wedge w \\ &= (v \vee \Delta(w, v)) \wedge ([v \vee \Delta(w, v)] \rightarrow v) \wedge w \\ &= v. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Corollary 4.18. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in \text{Fix}(u) \cap [u, w]$ and $v_1 \vee \Delta(w, u) = v_2 \vee \Delta(w, u)$. Then $v_1 = v_2$.*

Proof. This is immediate from the last corollary. $\square$

Putting the last corollary and corollary 4.8 together, we see that the function

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha : \text{Fix}(u) \cap [u, w] &\rightarrow \Phi(w) \cap [u, w] \\ \text{given by } \alpha(x) &= x \vee \Delta(w, u) \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined, order-preserving and one-one. We also want to show that it is onto.

Lemma 4.19. *Let $u \leq y \leq w$ and $\Delta(w, y) = y$. Then there is a y' with*

- (i) $u \leq y' \leq w$;
- (ii) $\Delta(y', u) = u$;
- (iii) $y' \vee \Delta(w, y') = y$.

Proof. Let $y' = y \wedge \delta(u)$ (which we note is also equal to $y \wedge \delta^w(u)$ and equal to $y \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u)$). Then we easily have $u \leq y' \leq \delta^w(u) \leq w$ and so $\Delta(y', u) = u$. Lastly

$$\begin{aligned} y' \vee \Delta(w, y') &= y' \vee \Delta(w, u) \\ &= y' \vee u \vee \Delta(w, u) \\ &= (y \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u)) \vee u \vee \Delta(w, u) \\ &= (y \vee u \vee \Delta(w, u)) \wedge ([u \vee \Delta(w, u)] \rightarrow u) \vee u \vee \Delta(w, u) \\ &\quad \text{in } [u, 1] \\ &= y \vee u \vee \Delta(w, u) \\ &= y \text{ by proposition 4.7.} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Corollary 4.20. *For all $u \leq v$*

$$(v \wedge \delta(u)) \vee \Delta(v, u) = v$$

and

$$(u \vee \Delta(v, u)) \wedge \delta(u) = u.$$

Proof. From the proof of the lemma, as $\Delta(v, v) = v$ and $v' = v \wedge \delta(u)$. The second equation is a special case of corollary 4.17. $\square$

Theorem 4.21. *Let $u \leq w$. Then the function*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha: \text{Fix}(u) \cap [u, w] &\rightarrow \Phi(w) \cap [u, w] \\ \text{given by} \quad \alpha(x) &= x \vee \Delta(w, u) \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism with inverse

$$\alpha^{-1}(y) = y \wedge \delta(u).$$

Proof. From the lemma and earlier remarks. $\square$

Let us now move on to global notions associated with fixed points.

Definition 4.22. *u is somewhere invariant iff there is some $v > u$ with $\Delta(v, u) = u$. If u is not somewhere invariant then we say it is nowhere invariant.*

Lemma 4.23. *u is nowhere invariant iff $u \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, u) = \mathbf{1}$.*

Proof. Clearly u is nowhere invariant iff $u = \delta(u)$. But

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(u) = u &\iff (u \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, u)) \rightarrow u = u \\ &\iff u \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, u) = \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Theorem 4.24. *If u is nowhere invariant and $u \leq v$ then v is nowhere invariant.*

Proof. If u is nowhere invariant then $v \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, v) \geq u \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, u) = \mathbf{1}$ and so v is nowhere invariant. $\square$

Corollary 4.25. *v is nowhere invariant iff there is some $u \leq v$ with $\delta(u) \leq v$.*

Proof. If v is nowhere invariant, then $v = \delta(v)$ and we are done.

If $\delta(u) \leq v$ and v is somewhere invariant, then $\delta(u)$ is somewhere invariant, which contradicts corollary 4.11. $\square$

Definition 4.26. *Let $\mathcal{N}(M) = \{p \in M \mid p \text{ is nowhere invariant}\}$.*

We now use some ideas from cubic implication algebras.

Definition 4.27. *Let $a \in M$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a^* &= \{b \mid b \geq \Delta(y, a) \text{ for some } y \geq a\} \\ \mathcal{L}_a &= \mathcal{L}_a^* \cap \mathcal{N}(M). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.28.

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \mathcal{L}_{\delta(a)} = \mathcal{L}_{\delta(a)}^*.$$

Proof. The last equality is exactly the last corollary.

Clearly $a \leq \delta(a)$ implies $\mathcal{L}_{\delta(a)}^* \subseteq \mathcal{L}_a$.

Next, if $x \geq a$ is in $\mathcal{N}(M)$ then $x = \delta(x) \geq \delta(a)$.

Now, from the proof of theorem 4.15 we note that $y \geq a$ implies $\Delta(\delta(y), a) = \Delta(y, a)$ and also we know that $\delta(y) = y \vee \delta(a)$. So, if $x \geq \Delta(y, a)$ for some $y \geq a$ we may assume that $\delta(y) = y \geq \delta(a)$.

But then $\Delta(\Delta(y, \delta(a)), \Delta(y, a)) = \Delta(y, \Delta(\delta(a), a)) = \Delta(y, a)$ and so $\Delta(y, \delta(a)) \leq \delta(\Delta(y, a))$. As we also have $a' = \Delta(y, a) \leq y$, symmetrically, we have $\Delta(y, \delta(a')) \leq \delta(a)$ and so $\Delta(y, \delta(a)) = \delta(\Delta(y, a))$.

Hence, if $x \geq a'$ we have $x \geq \delta(a') = \Delta(y, \delta(a))$ and so $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\delta(a)}^*$. $\square$

Theorem 4.29. $\mathcal{N}(M)$ is a cubic implication algebra.

Proof. We recall the axioms of a cubic implication algebra $\langle \mathcal{M}, 1, \vee, \Delta \rangle$:

- a. $x \leq y$ implies $\Delta(y, x) \vee x = y$;
- b. $x \leq y \leq z$ implies $\Delta(z, \Delta(y, x)) = \Delta(\Delta(z, y), \Delta(z, x))$;
- c. $x \leq y$ implies $\Delta(y, \Delta(y, x)) = x$;
- d. $x \leq y \leq z$ implies $\Delta(z, x) \leq \Delta(z, y)$.

If $xy = \Delta(1, \Delta(x \vee y, y)) \vee y$ then

- e. $(xy)y = x \vee y$;
- f. $x(yz) = y(xz)$.

All that we need to show are (a) and that $((x \vee y) \rightarrow y) = xy$. The rest follow from previous results.

(a) follows from theorem 4.21 as that theorem implies that if $x \leq y$ then $\delta(x) \vee \Delta(\delta(y), x) = \delta(y)$. As $\delta(x) = x$ and $\delta(y) = y$ we get (a). ■

Also, from the last theorem, if $x \leq y$ are both in $\mathcal{N}(M)$ then so is $\Delta(y, x)$ and so $\Delta(y, x) \vee \Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) = 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \vee x \vee y &= \Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \vee y \\ &\geq \Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \vee \Delta(y, x) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Also $\Delta(y, x) = y \wedge \Delta(1, (y \rightarrow x)) \leq \Delta(1, (y \rightarrow x))$ and so $\Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \leq (y \rightarrow x)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x \wedge y \\ &\leq [\Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \vee x] \wedge y \\ &\leq [(y \rightarrow x) \vee x] \wedge y \\ &= (y \rightarrow x) \wedge y \\ &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we must have $(y \rightarrow x) = \Delta(1, \Delta(y, x)) \vee x$ for $x \leq y$ in $\mathcal{N}(M)$. □

Corollary 4.30. For any $a \in M$ $\mathcal{L}_a$ is an MR-algebra.

Proof. As $\mathcal{L}_a = \mathcal{L}_{\delta(a)}$ and $\delta(a) \in \mathcal{N}(M)$ which is a cubic implication algebra. □

We want to obtain a full characterization of $\mathcal{L}_a^*$ for any a . First there are some technical lemmas.

Lemma 4.31. Let $z \geq y \geq a$ and $a_y = \Delta(y, a)$. Then

$$a \vee \Delta(z, a) = a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y).$$

Proof. First note that it suffices to show that $a \leq a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y)$ as then $\Delta(z, a) \leq a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y)$ and so $a \vee \Delta(z, a) \leq a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y)$. Symmetrically, as $a = \Delta(y, a_y)$, we also have $a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y) \leq a \vee \Delta(z, a)$.

$$\begin{aligned} a &\leq a \vee a_y \\ &= a_y \vee \Delta(y, a_y) \\ &\leq a_y \vee \Delta(z, a_y) \quad \text{by corollary 4.13.} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.32. *Let x, y and a be such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & a \vee \Delta(1, a) \leq x \\ \text{and} \quad & \delta(a) \vee (x \rightarrow \Delta(y, a)) \leq y. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\Delta(y, (x \rightarrow \Delta(y, a))) = (x \rightarrow a).$$

Proof. Let $a_y = \Delta(y, a)$. Note that $a \vee \Delta(y, a) \leq a \vee \Delta(1, a) \leq x$, and so $a_y \leq x$.

By definition

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y)) &= y \wedge \Delta(1, (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow a_y))). \\ \text{And } (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow a_y)) &= (x \rightarrow a_y) \vee (y \rightarrow a_y) \\ &= (x \wedge y \rightarrow a_y). \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Thus } \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y)) = y \wedge \Delta(1, ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y)).$$

We also note that $y \geq y \wedge x \geq a \vee \Delta(y, a)$ and so $\Delta(y, y \wedge x) = y \wedge x$. This implies $\Delta(y \wedge x, a) = \Delta(y, a)$ and so $\Delta(y \wedge x, a_y) = a$.

Now

$$\begin{aligned} x \wedge \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y)) &= x \wedge y \wedge \Delta(1, (x \wedge y \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= \Delta(x \wedge y, a_y) \quad \text{by definition} \\ &= a \quad \text{by the last paragraph.} \\ x \vee \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y)) &= x \vee [y \wedge \Delta(1, ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y))] \\ &= [x \vee y] \wedge [x \vee \Delta(1, ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y))] \quad \text{in } [a, 1] \end{aligned}$$

Now $x \geq a \vee \Delta(1, a)$ and $y \geq \delta(a)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} x \vee y &\geq (a \vee \Delta(1, a)) \vee \delta(a) \\ &= a \vee \Delta(1, a) \vee ((a \vee \Delta(1, a)) \rightarrow a) \\ &= 1 \text{ and} \end{aligned}$$

$x \geq a \vee \Delta(1, a)$ implies $\Delta(1, x) = x$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} x \vee \Delta(1, ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y)) &= \Delta(1, x) \vee \Delta(1, (x \wedge y \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= \Delta(1, x \vee ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &\geq \Delta(1, (x \wedge y) \vee ((x \wedge y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= \Delta(1, 1) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $x \vee \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y)) = 1$.

It follows that $(x \rightarrow a) = \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y))$. □

Corollary 4.33. *Let y_1 and y_2 be greater than $\delta(a)$. Let $a_i = \Delta(y_i, a)$ and suppose that $x \geq a_1 \vee a_2$. Then*

$$\Delta(y_1, (x \rightarrow a_1) \wedge \delta(a_1)) = \Delta(y_2, (x \rightarrow a_2) \wedge \delta(a_2)).$$

Proof. We have $\delta(a_i) = ((a_i \vee \Delta(1, a_i)) \rightarrow a_i)$ and so $(x \rightarrow a_i) \wedge \delta(a_i) = (x \rightarrow a_i) \wedge ((a_i \vee \Delta(1, a_i)) \rightarrow a_i) = ((x \vee a_i \vee \Delta(1, a_i)) \rightarrow a_i)$ and we know that $x \vee a_i \vee \Delta(1, a_i) = x \vee \Delta(1, x)$. Thus

$$\Delta(y_i, (x \rightarrow a_i) \wedge \delta(a_i)) = \Delta(y_i, (x \vee \Delta(1, x) \rightarrow a_i)).$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \vee \Delta(1, a) &= a_i \vee \Delta(1, a_i) \leq x \vee \Delta(1, x) \\ ((x \vee \Delta(1, x)) \rightarrow a_i) &\leq y_i \\ \delta(a) &\leq y_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then we apply the lemma to get $\Delta(y_i, ((x \vee \Delta(1, x)) \rightarrow a_i)) = ((x \vee \Delta(1, x)) \rightarrow a)$. As this is independent of i we are done. $\square$

Theorem 4.34.

$$\mathcal{L}_a^* \simeq \mathcal{L}_a \times [a, \delta(a)]^r$$

where $[a, \delta(a)]^r$ is the interval $[a, \delta(a)]$ with the reverse ordering.

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi: \mathcal{L}_a^* &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}_a \times [a, \delta(a)] \text{ by} \\ \Psi(x) &= \langle x \vee \delta(a_y), \Delta(y, (x \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y)) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $x \geq \Delta(y, a) = a_y$ and $y \geq \delta(a)$.

By the last corollary, $\Psi(x)$ is independent of the choice of y . Since $x \vee \delta(a_y) \geq \delta(a_y)$ we must have

$$\begin{aligned} x \vee \delta(a_y) &= \delta(x \vee \delta(a_y)) \\ &\geq \delta(x) \\ &\geq \delta(a_y) \end{aligned}$$

so that $x \vee \delta(a_y) = \delta(x)$ is also independent of the choice of y .

$\Delta(y, \bullet): [a, \delta(a)] \rightarrow [a_y, \delta(a_y)]$ is an isomorphism so the second component is in $[a, \delta(a)]$. $\blacksquare$

The second component is also equal to $((x \vee \Delta(1, x)) \rightarrow a)$ so clearly order is reversed on the second component and preserved on the first component.

Ψ is one-one: as if $\Psi(x_1) = \Psi(x_2)$ then $\langle \delta(x_1), ((x_1 \vee \Delta(1, x_1)) \rightarrow a) \rangle = \langle \delta(x_2), ((x_2 \vee \Delta(1, x_2)) \rightarrow a) \rangle$ and so $\delta(x_1 \vee x_2) = \delta(x_1)$ and $x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \Delta(1, x_1 \vee x_2) = x_1 \vee \Delta(1, x_1)$. Thus we get $\Psi(x_1) = \Psi(x_1 \vee x_2)$.

We begin by assuming that $x_2 \geq x_1 \geq \Delta(y, a) = a_y$ for some $y \geq \delta(a)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 \vee \delta(a_y) &= x_2 \vee \delta(a_y) \text{ and} \\ \Delta(y, (x_1 \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y)) &= \Delta(y, (x_2 \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y)) \\ \text{whence } (x_1 \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y) &= (x_2 \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y) \text{ and so} \\ x_1 \wedge (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) &= x_2 \wedge (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y). \\ \text{Now } x_1 &= (x_1 \vee \delta(a_y)) \wedge (x_1 \wedge (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= (x_2 \vee \delta(a_y)) \wedge (x_2 \wedge (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= x_2. \end{aligned}$$

From this, in the general case we get $x_1 = x_1 \vee x_2 = x_2$.

Ψ is onto: Let $z \in \mathcal{L}_a$ (so that $z \geq \Delta(y, \delta(a)) = \delta(a_y)$ for some $y \geq \delta(a)$) and let $w \in [a, \delta(a)]$. Then let

$$s = z \wedge (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y).$$

(The meet exists in $[a_y, 1]$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} [z \wedge (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y)] \vee \delta(a_y) &= (z \vee \delta(a_y)) \wedge ((\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \vee \delta(a_y)) \\ \text{and } (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \vee \delta(a_y) &\geq (\Delta(y, \delta(a)) \rightarrow a_y) \vee \delta(a_y) \text{ as } w \geq \delta(a) \\ &= \delta(a_y) \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) \\ &= 1 \text{ so that} \end{aligned}$$

$$s \vee \delta(a_y) = z \vee \delta(a_y) = z.$$

$$\begin{aligned} [z \wedge (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y)] \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) &= (z \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \wedge ((\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) \text{ as } z \geq \delta(a_y) \\ &= (\Delta(y, w) \wedge \delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) \\ &= (\Delta(y, w) \wedge \Delta(y, \delta(a)) \rightarrow a_y) \\ &= (\Delta(y, w \wedge \delta(a)) \rightarrow a_y) \\ &= (\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \quad \text{as } w \leq \delta(a). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence } \Delta(y, (s \rightarrow a_y) \wedge \delta(a_y)) &= \Delta(y, (s \vee (\delta(a_y) \rightarrow a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= \Delta(y, ((\Delta(y, w) \rightarrow a_y) \rightarrow a_y)) \\ &= \Delta(y, \Delta(y, w)) \\ &= w. \end{aligned}$$

And so $\Psi(s) = \langle z, w \rangle$. ■

□

Using earlier results, we can prove a little more.

Theorem 4.35. *There is an embedding*

$$e: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(M) \times \Phi(1)$$

whose image is upwards closed.

Proof. Define $e(x) = \langle \delta(x), x \vee \Delta(1, x) \rangle$. Clearly e preserves order. By corollary 4.20 we have $\delta(x) \wedge (x \vee \Delta(1, x)) = x$ and so e is one-one.

Also if $\langle a, b \rangle \geq \langle \delta(x), x \vee \Delta(1, x) \rangle$ then $y = a \wedge b$ exists and is greater than x . We need to show that $\delta(y) = a$ and $y \vee \Delta(1, y) = b$.

$$\begin{aligned} (a \rightarrow a \wedge b) &= (a \rightarrow x) \vee (a \wedge b) \\ &= ((a \rightarrow x) \vee a) \wedge ((a \rightarrow x) \vee b) \\ &= (a \rightarrow x) \vee b \\ &= b \quad \text{as } (a \rightarrow x) \leq (\delta(x) \rightarrow x) = x \vee \Delta(1, x) \leq b. \\ \text{Also } b &\geq x \vee \Delta(1, x) \text{ implies } \Delta(1, b) = b. \\ \text{Thus } \Delta(a, a \wedge b) &= a \wedge \Delta(1, (a \rightarrow a \wedge b)) \\ &= a \wedge \Delta(1, b) \\ &= a \wedge b. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $a \leq \delta(a \wedge b) \leq \delta(a) = a$.

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta(a \wedge b) \rightarrow a \wedge b) &= a \wedge b \vee \Delta(1, a \wedge b), \text{ and} \\ (\delta(a \wedge b) \rightarrow a \wedge b) &= (a \rightarrow a \wedge b) \\ &= b \end{aligned}$$

so that $a \wedge b \vee \Delta(1, a \wedge b) = b$.

Hence $e(a \wedge b) = \langle a, b \rangle$ and so the range of e is upwards closed. $\square$

From this proof it remains to investigate the structure of $\Phi(1)$. There is one very simple case for $\Phi(1)$.

Theorem 4.36. *If $M = \mathcal{L}_a$ for some a then $\Phi(1) = [a \vee \Delta(1, a), 1]$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \Phi(1)$. Then $x \geq \Delta(y, a) = a_y$ for some $y \geq \delta(a)$, and so $x \geq a_y \vee \Delta(1, a_y)$. But by lemma 4.31 this gives $x \geq a \vee \Delta(1, a)$.

As $[a \vee \Delta(1, a), 1] \subseteq \Phi(1)$ we are done. $\square$

Recalling that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [a \vee \Delta(1, a), 1] & \simeq [a, \delta(a)] & \simeq [a, \delta(a)]^r \\ y & \mapsto y \wedge \delta(a) & \mapsto (y \wedge \delta(a) \rightarrow a) \wedge \delta(a) = (y \rightarrow a) \wedge \delta(a) \end{array}$$

we see that the mapping e of the last theorem is really the same as the isomorphism of theorem 4.34. It is rare however to obtain an isomorphism.

In general, all we know is that $\Phi(1)$ is an implication algebra. In the finite case we are also able to compute its dimension from the dimension of the multicube and can show that it is uniform – ie the dimension of $[m, 1]$ for m a minimal element of $\Phi(1)$ is constant.

5. ENVELOPES

Envelopes arise as natural covering structures in the theory of implication algebras and in the theory of cubic implication algebras.

If $\mathcal{I}$ is implication algebra then there is a meet-closed implication algebra $\text{env}(\mathcal{I})$ and an embedding $e: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \text{env}(\mathcal{I})$ such that

- (a) the range of e is upwards-closed and generates $\text{env}(\mathcal{I})$ (using $\wedge$ and $\rightarrow$);
- (b) if $f: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is an implication morphism to a meet-closed implication algebra $\mathcal{M}$ then there is a unique extension to an implication morphism $\widehat{f}: \text{env}(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\widehat{f} \circ e = f$.

Trying to apply the ideas that produce this envelope to symmetric implication algebras directly will fail – although T lifts the resulting algebra need not be in the variety of the original.

For cubic implication algebras (which are also implication algebras) a different form of envelope is appropriate.

If $\mathcal{L}$ is a cubic implication algebra then there is an MR-algebra $\text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ and an embedding $e: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ such that

- (a) the range of e is upwards-closed and generates $\text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ (using caret and $\rightarrow$);
- (b) if $f: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a cubic morphism to a MR-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ then there is a unique extension to a cubic morphism $\widehat{f}: \text{env}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\widehat{f} \circ e = f$.

The analogous theorem for symmetric implication algebras is as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *If $\mathcal{L}$ is a symmetric implication algebra then there is a locally symmetric implication algebra $\text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ and an embedding $e: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ such that*

- (a) the range of e is upwards-closed and generates $\text{env}(\mathcal{L})$ (using caret and $\rightarrow$);
 (b) if $f: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a symmetric implication morphism to a locally symmetric implication algebra $\mathcal{M}$ then there is a unique extension to a symmetric implication morphism $\widehat{f}: \text{env}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\widehat{f} \circ e = f$.

Proof. The simplest case is of a finitely presented implication algebra, ie an implication algebra $\mathcal{I}$ such that $m(\mathcal{I}) = \{a \mid a \text{ is minimal}\}$ is finite and every x in $\mathcal{I}$ is above some a in $m(\mathcal{I})$.

For this case $T: m(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow m(\mathcal{I})$ is a finite permutation of order two and so its disjoint cycle representation consists entirely of one and two cycles.

Notice that if $a \in \mathcal{I}$ and $T(a) = a$ then every $b \geq a$ is also a fixed point of T – as $1 = (b \rightarrow T(b)) \vee a \vee T(a) = b \rightarrow T(b)$ and so $b \leq T(b)$. Therefore $T(b) \leq T^2(b) = b$ and so $b = T(b)$.

Also $a \vee T(a)$ is always a fixed point of T .

Let us first consider the case when $|m(\mathcal{I})| = 2$. If T fixes everything we're done, as $b \geq a$ always implies $b \wedge (b \rightarrow a) = a$ in an implication algebra.

Otherwise $m(\mathcal{I}) = \{a, b\}$ and $b = T(a)$ – as $a \leq T(a)$ implies $a = T(a)$ and so $b = T(b)$. If $b \leq T(a)$ then $T(b) \leq a$ and so $T(b) = a$ and $b = T(a)$.

Then T is the identity above $a \vee b$ and so we take the structure $\mathcal{L} = [a \vee b, \mathbf{1}] \times \mathcal{J}([a, a \vee b])$. Then define $\varphi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ by

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \langle x \vee a \vee b, [a, x \wedge (a \vee b)] \rangle & \text{if } x \geq a \\ \langle x \vee a \vee b, \Delta(\mathbf{1}, [a, T(x \wedge (a \vee b))]) \rangle & \text{if } x \geq b \end{cases}$$

This is an implication morphism because it is on each interval.

In general we use induction on $|m(\mathcal{I})|$. Pick any $a \in m(\mathcal{I})$ and consider $m'(\mathcal{I}) = m(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \{a, T(a)\}$. Then $\mathcal{I}' = \bigcup_{b \in m'(\mathcal{I})} [a, b]$ can be embedded into some $M = J \times \mathcal{J}(B)$ with upwards-closed image. Then we consider the set $A = \{a \vee b \mid b \in m'\}$ and its image A' . In both $\mathcal{I}$ and M $\wedge A$ exists and the intervals $[\wedge A, \mathbf{1}]$ and $[\wedge A', \mathbf{1}]$ are isomorphic – in fact the embedding can be extended to an isomorphism from $[\wedge A, \mathbf{1}]$ to $[\wedge A', \mathbf{1}]$.

If $a = T(a)$ then we extend the embedding in a natural way to include $[a, \wedge A]$ to $J \times [a, \wedge A]$.

If $a \neq T(a)$ we extend the embedding as in the cardinality 2 case to get $[a, \wedge A]$ going into $\mathcal{J}(B \times [a, \wedge A])$ and being Δ on $[T(a), T(\wedge A)]$.

For the general case, we use free algebras as usual – take the free multicubic implication algebra (with Δ made total as described above) on generators $\mathcal{I}$ with extra relations

$$x \vee \mathcal{F} y = x \vee_{\mathcal{I}} y; \quad x \rightarrow \mathcal{F} y = x \rightarrow_{\mathcal{I}} y; \quad \Delta(\mathbf{1}, x) \mathcal{F} = T(x)$$

for all x and y in $\mathcal{I}$.

The mapping is clear. Checking that it is an embedding uses the finite case – any amount of information we need in a computation is finite and can be checked in a finitely presented subalgebra. Because it must work therein, it works in this bigger arena.

Checking that the range is upwards-closed is a simple induction on complexity of words using the extra relations. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abad and J. P. D. Varela, *Representation of Cubic Lattices by Symmetric Implication Algebras*, Order **23** (2006), 173–178.
- [2] C. G. Bailey and J. S. Oliveira, *An Axiomatization for Cubic Algebras*, Mathematical Essays in Honor of Gian-Carlo Rota (B. E. Sagan and R. P. Stanley, eds.), Birkhäuser, 1998., pp. 305–334.
- [3] ———, *Cube-like structures generated by filters*, Algebra Universalis **49** (2003), 129–158.

- [4] N. Metropolis and G.-C. Rota, *Combinatorial Structure of the faces of the n -Cube*, SIAM J.Appl.Math. **35** (1978), 689–694.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND,

E-mail address: Colin.Bailey@vuw.ac.nz

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORIES, RICHLAND, WA, U.S.A.

E-mail address: Joseph.Oliveira@pnl.gov